

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Rejection of the pending claims in the Office Action of August 23, 2006.

Claims 1 through 13 and 15 through 21 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 15, 20, and 21 have been amended herein.

Claim 14 was previously canceled herein.

Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification such as in paragraphs [0023], [0049], [0057], and [0058]. No new matter has been entered to the disclosure as the amendment clearly complies with 35 U.S.C. § 132. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on Wood *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,965,958), and further in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent 6,738,841) and Tyler *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,638,498)

Claims 1 through 13 and 15 through 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,965,958) (hereinafter “Wood”), and further in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent 6,738,841) and Tyler *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,638,498) (hereinafter “Tyler”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant asserts that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant’s disclosure.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that Wood, Wolff, and Tyler, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of presently amended independent claim 1 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness regarding the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant asserts that the cited

references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet providing a printer control panel operable to show rasterized images of said data.” None of the cited references teach or suggest a printer control panel operable to show rasterized images of data stored in a printer. As noted by the Examiner regarding claim 6, Wood does not disclose viewing rasterized images. *Office Action mailed August 23, 2006, page 4*. The Examiner takes Official Notice that viewing rasterized files is obvious. *Id.* Applicant asserts regarding presently amended independent claim 1 that the claim language of “to show rasterized images” cannot be extricated from the claim limitation of “a printer control panel operable to show rasterized images of said data.” Therefore, the printer control panel has to be operable to show the images. Additionally, the images of the data shown are of data stored in the job retention memory of the printer. That is different than a printer control panel displaying a rasterized image of a print job prior to the sending of the print job to a printer. Rather, the claim, stated another way, provides for the viewing of rasterized images of print jobs that have already been sent to the printer, including print jobs that have already been printed. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a printer control panel. Therefore, none of the cited references teach or suggest this limitation.

Applicant further asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet further providing key word search ability via said printer control panel of text within a print job.” None of the cited references disclose a printer control panel capable of such a function.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established because any combination of the cited art cannot and does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 through 13 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 1.

Applicant asserts that claim 6 is further allowable because Official Notice of obviousness is not appropriate for the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 15, Applicant asserts that Wood, Wolff, and Tyler, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of

presently amended independent claim 15 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness regarding the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet able to provide a printer control panel operable to provide rasterized images of said data.” None of the cited references teach or suggest a printer control panel operable to provide rasterized images of data stored in a printer. As noted by the Examiner regarding claim 6, Wood does not disclose viewing rasterized images. *Office Action mailed August 23, 2006, page 4*. The Examiner takes Official Notice that viewing rasterized files is obvious. *Id.* Applicant asserts regarding presently amended independent claim 15 that the claim language of “to provide rasterized images” cannot be extricated from the claim limitation of “a printer control panel operable to provide rasterized images of said data.” Therefore, the printer control panel has to be operable to provide the images. Additionally, the images of the data provided are of data stored in the job retention memory of the printer. That is different than a printer control panel displaying a rasterized image of a print job prior to the sending of the print job to a printer. Rather, the claim, stated another way, provides for the viewing of rasterized images of print jobs that have already been sent to the printer, including print jobs that have already been printed. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a printer control panel. Therefore, none of the cited references teach or suggest this limitation.

Applicant further asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet further able to provide key word search ability utilizing said printer control panel of text within a print job.” None of the cited references disclose a printer control panel capable of such a function.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established because any combination of the cited art cannot and does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16 through 19 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 15.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 20, Applicant asserts that Wood, Wolff, and Tyler, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of presently amended independent claim 20 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness regarding the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet programmed to provide a printer control panel operable for viewing rasterized images of said data.” None of the cited references teach or suggest a printer control panel operable for viewing rasterized images of data stored in a printer. As noted by the Examiner regarding claim 6, Wood does not disclose viewing rasterized images. *Office Action mailed August 23, 2006, page 4.* The Examiner takes Official Notice that viewing rasterized files is obvious. *Id.* Applicant asserts regarding presently amended independent claim 20 that the claim language of “viewing rasterized images” cannot be extricated from the claim limitation of “a printer control panel operable for viewing rasterized images of said data.” Therefore, the printer control panel has to be operable for viewing the images. Additionally, the images viewed are of data stored in the job retention memory of the printer. That is different than a printer control panel displaying a rasterized image of a print job prior to the sending of the print job to a printer. Rather, the claim, stated another way, provides for the viewing of rasterized images of print jobs that have already been sent to the printer, including print jobs that have already been printed. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a printer control panel. Therefore, none of the cited references teach or suggest this limitation.

Applicant further asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet further programmed to provide key word search ability via said printer control panel of text within a print job.” None of the cited references disclose a printer control panel capable of such a function.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established because any combination of the cited art cannot and does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 20 is allowable.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 21, Applicant asserts that Wood, Wolff, and Tyler, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of presently amended independent claim 21 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness regarding the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet programmed for providing a printer control panel operable to show rasterized images of said data.” None of the cited references teach or suggest a printer control panel operable to show rasterized images of data stored in a printer. As noted by the Examiner regarding claim 6, Wood does not disclose viewing rasterized images. *Office Action mailed August 23, 2006, page 4*. The Examiner takes Official Notice that viewing rasterized files is obvious. *Id.* Applicant asserts regarding presently amended independent claim 21 that the claim language of “to show rasterized images” cannot be extricated from the claim limitation of “a printer control panel operable to show rasterized images of said data.” Therefore, the printer control panel has to be operable to show the images. Additionally, the images shown are of data stored in the job retention memory of the printer. That is different than a printer control panel displaying a rasterized image of a print job prior to sending the print job to the printer. Rather, the claim, stated another way, provides for the viewing of rasterized images of print jobs that have already been sent to the printer, including print jobs that have already been printed. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a printer control panel. Therefore, none of the cited references teach or suggest this limitation.

Applicant further asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of the claimed invention calling for “said at least one applet further programmed to provide key word search ability via said printer control panel of text within a print job.” None of the cited references disclose a printer control panel capable of such a function.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established because any combination of the cited art cannot and does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 21 is allowable.

After carefully considering the cited art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicant has amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited art.

Applicant asserts that claims 1 through 13 and 15 through 21 are clearly allowable over the cited art.

Applicants request entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment does not require any further search or consideration.

The amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: October 18, 2006
JRD/dlm:lmh